My thoughts on National-Socialist, Hollywood and Soviet film production.

In April 2018, I was going over film reviews in the New York Times as usual and noticed a review of the film Hitler's Hollywood. I was never interested in German cinema and did not even know that it existed, even though I love cinema. All I knew was the widespread legend that all German cinema until 1933 was based on Jews who went to Hollywood after Hitler came to power. As a result, according to the same legend, German cinema died, turned into primitive propaganda and there was no point in watching it. So, this topic interested me in some way, and I decided to watch this documentary.

This documentary changed my life and worldview. As a result of watching this film, I began to doubt the veracity of the legend about the death of German cinema. I decided to watch several films, starting with “The Jew Suss” and “Romance in a Minor Key” and I must say I was stunned by the level of these films. Then I looked at all the films available on the Internet that had already been translated into Russian or English. I started commissioning translations of films that were only in German. I found myself in a completely different, wonderful world of cinema that almost no one knows about. In the world of Kautner, Harlan, Liebeneiner, Steinhoff, George, Marian, Janning, Leander and many others. As a result, I have formed the opinion that the best films in the history of cinema were created during the Third Reich. I have decided to make an English and Russian-language website with films made during the Third Reich, so that a thinking viewer could appreciate the artistic value of these films in comparison with Hollywood, Soviet (Stalinist period) and European products.

While studying this topic, I was surprised to discover that some of the films were banned by allied victors with “developed/advanced democracies”. How could this happen? But what about all these rights and freedoms that the leaders of the “free world” stand for? I must say that due to the events in the United States that began to occur after Trump’s nomination for the presidency and restrictions during Covid, I had serious doubts about the professed freedoms and so-called democracy in the West. I decided to read Mein Kampf and it made me pay attention and think about some of the developments taking place in the world over the past 150 years. I wrote about this in my essay on Mein Kampf. Here I want to share my thoughts about German, American and partly Soviet cinema, in which I try to answer why German cinema of this period was consigned to oblivion.

I spent my youth in the USSR, and accordingly I was raised on Soviet, French and Italian cinema. Having lived most of my life in the USA, I have formed a negative opinion of Hollywood products with few exceptions. But I in no way associated the very low average quality of

Hollywood films, their political component with my fellow Jews, who, figuratively speaking, have had a controlling stake in Hollywood since its birth.

So, before I get in a more detailed examination of Hollywood products in comparison with German ones, I would like to draw attention to the educational level of shtetl Jews from the Russian Empire, the founders and owners of Hollywood studios of that period. To say that they were semi-literate is an understatement. Three grades of education for everyone. For example: yesterday he was selling gloves at the market (Goldwyn-MGM), today he is a producer and co-owner of a film studio. Almost all the owners of film studios in Hollywood of that time have similar biographies. I pose a rhetorical question: can such people create anything of cultural value or anything artistically significant at all? These were people who had no idea what European culture, history and civilization were. For these people, cinema is a business, and the main motivation is profit. Such concepts as artistic value and raising the cultural level of the young and rather uncultured American nation through cinema were completely alien to them. But then things took an even worse turn. For content (directors, screenwriters, writers, etc.), this semi-literate, shtetl Jews hired other leftist Jews, communists, Stalin's and USSR sympathizers. This group, in addition to money (this is always important for them despite the "higher values"), had another goal. Namely: to disintegrate and destroy the existing society from within through hidden and overt propaganda and agitation of Marxism/Bolshevism in the most popular art for the masses - cinema.

In addition to those whom we usually call agents of Soviet influence, another group of Soviet spies of Jewish descent flourished under the cover of the Western film industry. Such scoundrels as the father of Vladimir Pozner (Vladimir Pozner. "Parting with Illusions"). Watching through the films of this period, my attention was drawn to the murky biography of two quite successful western filmmakers from Kiev - Grisha (Gregor) Rabinovich and Anatoly Litvak. How did they manage to immigrate from the Soviet Union to Berlin in 1925? Then this could only be done with the permission of the Soviet Authorities (OGPU). Where did Grisha get the money for his film producing business? In short, if somewhere in the depths of the FSB archives, there are files on Soviet agents Grisha Rabinovich and Anatoly Litvak, I would not be surprised.

In general, the alliance was formed between greed and villainy.

Frankly speaking, the American Anglo-Saxon elites showed stunning irresponsibility and naivety by handing over the most important cultural sphere to scoundrels. These fools were most concerned that there would be no naked female breasts or a French kiss on the screen. The Marxist Jews made them look like suckers, slipping cultural swill and ideological poison to the people under the guise of cinema. The patriotic American elites realized it too late. Senator McCarthy tried to cleanse Hollywood of this scum. But it was already too late. The Marxist-Jewish elites were already too strong and influential. McCarthy lost this fight. As a

result, Hollywood cinema has made and continues to make its significant contribution to bringing white culture into the state of decay and degradation in which Western civilization finds itself today.

It must be said that the National Socialists and Bolsheviks were aware of the enormous role of cinema in the ideological and cultural education of the masses and the danger it could pose to the health of the nation without being under state supervision. As a result, they took control of the film industry into their own hands.

A few words about Soviet cinema of the Stalinist period. With a few exceptions, this is primitive cinema compared to German cinema. Main characteristics: low budget, obvious and almost everywhere present ideological component, stereotypical, one-dimensional roles, primitive dialogues, Hollywood's imitations like Jolly Fellows, 1934. The best are basic and simple comedies like "Volga- Volga, 1938" and "The Foundling, 1939".

It must be admitted that because there were strict ideological restrictions in the USSR, Jews in general had a positive influence on Soviet cinema.

Before we can understand why German cinema of this period was condemned to oblivion, we must answer the question of what the purpose of art is in general and in cinema in particular. In my opinion, the goal of cinema is to increase the intellectual, cultural and spiritual level of the people, to groom a thinking person, a patriot of their country, a defender of the homeland, worthy fathers and mothers in a society, where everyone is one family, to promote family values, etc. That is, what we understand by the term "folk cinema". Can most Hollywood productions, including modern ones, be described as folk cinema? I don't think so. Through this prism, I analyze and compare shtetl Marxist cinema with National Socialist cinema.

I have conducted my analysis according to two criteria: production/cultural value and ideological/propaganda value.

Main production characteristics of shtetl Marxist Hollywood cinema based on my observations:

1. Low budgets (up to the mid-50s).

2. Weak cast.

3. Primitive dialogues and scripts (stories, themes).

4. Stereotypes.

5. Distortion of history and classical works, often for the purpose of promoting Marxist values.

6. Disrespect for the viewer (treating the viewer as an idiot).

The main ideological characteristics of shtetl Marxist Hollywood cinema based on my observations:

1. Pacifism.

2. Glorification/justification of Marxism/Bolshevism, especially under the guise of “anti-fascism”.

3. Hatred and contempt for national elites.

4. Inciting class and racial hatred.

5. Inciting hatred towards government and commercial institutions.

6. The message to abandon traditional family values and morals.

7. LGBT propaganda.

8. Making fun of or portraying traditional or religious Jews in unsavory ways.

9. Priority of individual interests over public ones (individualism).

10. Glorification and romanticization of criminals. (Robin Hoods and victims of social injustice/circumstances).

Hollywood has succeeded in creating pseudo-reality and myths of its own superiority. In this pseudo-reality, primitive and wretched films are presented and promoted as the greatest films of mankind. Actors and actresses who have no talent and show nothing are presented and promoted as geniuses.

For example, let’s discuss two of the “greatest” films in the history of mankind - “Casablanca” and “Citizen Kane”.

"Casablanca": a tear-jerking love triangle and a low-budget fairy tale, shot entirely in the studio. The two main characters, Humphrey Bogart and Paul Henreid, play the entire film with the same wooden and expressionless faces. In Hollywood mythology, Humphrey Bogart is one of the greatest actors of the 20th century. His entire acting skill lies in his ability to smoke and drink whiskey on camera. He has the same facial expression in all his films. The story, which does not stand up to criticism, is about a “freedom fighter” (communist) who escaped from a concentration camp and ended up on the territory controlled by the Vichy government which was allied with Germans. Gestapo for some reason cannot arrest this “freedom fighter”. The “fighter” against fascism is trying to obtain some kind of fake documents that would enable him to fly away, although everyone, including the Gestapo, already knows who he is and where he is. Ridiculous scene with the singing of the Marseillaise to spite the Germans in a restaurant. And of course, the character of Paul Henreid is presented as a hero since he fought in Spain on the side of the Republicans (Red murderers -Adm.) against the Spanish Fascists (Patriots-Adm.).

"Citizen Kane" has a solid budget, the production values of the film are superb, especially the cinematography. The acting is one-dimensional and unremarkable. But the main thing in this film is its ideological orientation. The main idea of the film is that the rich are bad, unhappy, lonely, miserable, vain, etc. The purpose of the film is to incite class hatred towards the rich. Something like the modern series "Descendants". The film is completely Marxist in its gist.

I would like to note outrageous cases of whites being portrayed as subhuman, especially in films where there is a conflict between Jews and non-Jews. For example, the film "Tevye", made in 1939. In this film, Ukrainians are literally depicted as subhuman animals, living in something like a stable and eating from one bowl almost with their hands against the backdrop of noble and civilized Jews.

"Knight Without Armor" 1937. A victim of the tsarist regime, an intelligent, honest and decent commissar, the Jew Axelstein is trying to somehow organize and reason with a wild pack of subhuman ordinary revolutionaries of indigenous ethnicities who do not want to obey the orders of the central committee. Now it is clear who is to blame for the crimes of the Bolsheviks - non-Jews. This film is the work of a shtetl and semi-literate producer, Korda.

"Splendor in the Grass" 1961 - All white gentile characters in the film are portrayed as subhuman/pigs/drunks/rapists. Film distributor – Warner Bros. (shtetl Jewish shop). Director Elia Kazan is, according to a legend, a purebred Greek. Wikipedia says that he is from a family of Anatolian Greeks. But this is at first glance. Having applied the methods of some “experts” in identifying hidden/secret Jews in the Russian-speaking world, I would like to draw attention to the same Wikipedia page that points to the purely “Greek” name of his maternal grandfather - Isaac, and his brother also had a purely “Greek” name Abraham (Abram). Moreover, his brother was born in Berlin and became a psychiatrist there. Not a very typical biography for Greek immigrants from Turkey. Mom read the Bible but did not go to church. It seems that the mother was a baptized Jew. But I’m judging a little more from the other side. Such a white-phobic and essentially anti-American film could only have been made by a hate-filled Jew with an inferiority complex. In principle, the biography of Eli Kazan and his personal revelations confirm my guesses about hatred and an inferiority complex.

“War for the Planet of the Apes” (2017) is an anti-white and anti-Christian film. All the whites (good and bad) die at the end of the film, leaving only blacks. Screenwriter, producer and distributors are Jewish liberals.

“Are you there, God? It's Me, Margaret" 2023 - an anti-Christian and generally anti-religious film. The wife's parents, Christian believers, are shown as wretched and primitive people who abandoned their daughter because she married a Jew. The husband's Jewish mother is portrayed in opposite, in a very positive light. The film is silent about how the husband’s parents would react to such a marriage if they were religious Jews. As to the cultural level of this “film”, then out of 106 minutes of total duration, 80 minutes are devoted to discussing the first menstruation in teenage girls. If you read Jewish movie critics (New York Times), this is one of the best films of our time. I would like to draw the reader’s attention to the producer of this “masterpiece” - James Lawrence Brooks. He was born and raised in a Jewish family, later changed his name and started introducing himself as Irish. You can't make it up.

“The Way We Were”, 1973 is a classic example of pro-Soviet agitation and propaganda plus the glorification of Marxist Jews. The main character, a Jewish communist, is presented in a very positive light, a kind of romantic and idealist who dreams of the happiness of all progressive humanity, a fighter against war, the bourgeoisie and fascism. Her fiery propaganda speech at the beginning of the film

seems to have been taken from the newspaper “Pravda” of the Stalin period. The opposite opinion is not presented in this film. The Anglo-Saxon elite youth are shown, of course, from the negative side. Guess the ethnicity of the creators of this “masterpiece”?

The “Crusades”, 1935 - completely distorted history for the purpose of promoting pacifism.

"Licorice Pizza", 2021 and "An American Pickle", 2020 depict traditional Jews as half-animals and buffoons.

"Bonnie and Clyde", 1967. Banks are evil. They are the source of all troubles. As a result, they can be robbed without a twinge of conscience. The movie justifies Bolsheviks idea “Rob what was robbed (rich-adm.).” In general, bandits and robbers are portrayed like noble Robin Hoods in Hollywood films, especially if they are Jews (the movie “Bugsy”).

I would like to give one very illustrative example exposing the methods of Marxist Jews in cinema. Look at the film “Mephisto”, directed in 1981 by Istvan Szabo and based on the novel by Klaus Mann. This film was awarded an Oscar.

Klaus Mann, a Marxist Jew, drug addict, homosexual and pedophile, writes a false libel in the form of a novel about a great German actor Gustav Grüngens, who rejected Mann as a lover. According to a decision of a post-war German court, the novel was banned as false and insulting the honor and dignity of Grüngens. And Klaus Mann - pedophile, drug addict and liar still passes as an eyewitness to the Holocaust. It is no wonder that because of such “witnesses” many question the figures and facts of this disaster.

Long after the court’s decision, another Jewish communist and part-time Hungarian KGB informer, István Szabó, based his film on this “novel”. The movie is about how the great actor sells his soul to the devil (the Nazis) for the sake of a successful acting career. After the fall of the Iron Curtain, it was revealed that Istvan Szabo worked for the Hungarian KGB. Truly, one must have Marxist-Jewish impudence for a KGB informer to moralize and talk about lofty matters. As usual, the film contains all the Marxist-Jewish stunts - stormtroopers beat up “peaceful” “anti-fascists” and ordinary passers-by, a high patron (Goering) sometimes speaks boorishly and disrespectful to the actor, and this, despite the fact that the Supreme leadership of Germany almost prayed to Grüngens, etc. Out of his stupidity, in the film, Szabo gave an “Aryan” definition of the character of Hamlet, which, in my opinion, is close to Shakespeare’s original idea. The famous Russian actor Vysotsky gave a very similar depiction to the character of Hamlet. Overall, contrary to his intention, Szabo’s film accurately reflects the situation in the USSR and the countries of the socialist “camp” and the role of scumbags like himself.

A very recent example. The movie "The Master and Margarita" 2024. I heard about mixed reviews and controversy, so I decided to watch it. As soon as I saw the Jewish names of the director and screenwriter, I immediately realized what it would be about. I was not mistaken. In principle, under the guise of a classic novel, they made primitive propaganda. The point of the film is that the Soviet Union was bad, modern Russia is the same shit, and here, the “filmmakers” raised propaganda to the next level by associating these countries with Nazi Germany. Moreover, classic Marxist-Jewish templates are used. The actor playing Voland is a German who looks like an SS officer and speaks German for almost the entire film. Pontius Pilatus makes his speech exactly like Hitler in Nuremberg with the same visuals. But,

here, the “filmmakers” decided to go further. Jesus Christ is depicted as some kind of dwarf, wretched and holy fool, up to Pilate's waist. Even shtetl Marxist Hollywood did not allow itself to do this. I wonder if they would have portrayed Moses like that. All this of course has nothing to do with the novel.

I have provided just a few examples above. This can go on ad infinitum.
The main features of National Socialist cinema based on my observations:
1. Good production values.
2. Appropriate budgets.
3. High professional level of actors.
4. Meaningful stories/intelligent dialogues.
5. Strengthening of family values and morals.
6. Respect and constructive criticism of elites.
7. Respect for state institutions.
8. Exposing the essence of Marxism/Bolshevism.
9. A call for readiness to make sacrifices for the nation.
10. Priority of public interests over personal ones.
11. Emphasis of patriotism.
12. Cooperation and harmony between people of various social strata as an alternative to the Marxist-Jewish class struggle. Building a classless society.

There are, of course, some shortcomings. For example: almost always happy endings and conflicts mostly between good people and very good people.

To compare production and cultural qualities of Hollywood and National Socialist cinema, the contrast of the following films is very indicative – “The Heart of the Queen”, 1940 / "Mary of Scots ", 1936; “Dreaming”, 1944/” Song of Love”, 1947; “Life of Rembrandt”, 1942/” Rembrandt”, 1936.

“The Heart of the Queen”, 1940/"Mary of Scots", 1936.

The Heart of the Queen's is one of the best, if not the best, films about Mary Stuart. The film by Karl Frohlich is a showcase of excellent direction, acting, design, cinematography and music. Compare this with the cartoonish 1936 Hollywood version of Mary of Scots, directed by the “great” American director John Ford, starring Katharine Hepburn as Queen Mary. Personally, I don’t think it is even possible to compare Zara Leander and Katharine Hepburn. Watch the scene between 45th and 48th minutes with Queen Mary (Katharine Hepburn) and Lord Bothwell (Fredrick March). Amateur or borderline ridiculous acting (high school drama class at best) and primitive dialog (“When my girl won’t see me, I am a storm”). Similar to the arguments between the working poor (supermarket saleswoman and her plumber husband). This movie accurately reflects the average level of Hollywood cinema.

“Dreaming”, 1944/” Song of Love”, 1947

“Dreaming” production values are top notch. Cinematography and acting are fantastic. The film is imbued with a special heartwarming atmosphere. It is acted and written in a soulful tone that suits the

style very well. There are some very effective scenes when Schumann begins to lose his mind, particularly one when his mind is gone, and he is a patient in a psychic ward. This is accompanied by deceptively happy music. It has a message and philosophical depth. In totality, an excellent piece of cinematic art, especially compared to the primitive and cliché-ridden 1947 Hollywood squalor "Love Song", directed by a former car salesman (can't make this up) Clarence Brown. The main feature of this film is the mediocre and terribly miscast 47-year-old Katharine Hepburn playing a 17-year-old pianist. The ridiculous episode in the kitchen, where Brahms washes the dishes and tries to slaughter a chicken with Schumann's assistance, underscores the cultural/intellectual level of this film and all of Hollywood.

Life of Rembrandt, 1942/ Rembrandt, 1936

The Life of Rembrandt, 1942 - the best version of all films about Rembrandt, shot by the staunch National Socialist and talented director Steinhoff. This is a stunning biopic of Rembrandt van Rijn, whose uncompromising pursuit of his artistic vision makes him one of the greatest painters of all times. The acting is masterful. Rembrandt himself is portrayed brilliantly by Ewald Balser, who perfectly conveys the artist's determination and humanity. A giant amongst pygmies. The scene where he paints Hendricke sitting (now in the National Gallery) while the bailiffs strip the house bare is unforgettable. The harsh realization that Genius is seldom recognized in its own lifetime and that giants are very often dragged down by pygmies makes the final scene where he gazes upon his cruelly neglected masterpiece 'The Night Watch' even more symbolic. The production values and score are exceptional. I want to draw the viewer's attention to Rembrandt's most profound philosophical monologue at the end of the film about the role and meaning of the artist in life. What is success for an artist? Artist's destiny and fate.

Then ask yourself the question: does this film raise the spiritual and cultural level of the people?

Now compare with the ridiculous pseudo-biographical film, concocted by the shtetl producer Alexander Korda in 1936. Here Rembrandt is primitive, a sort of a simple people's guy, carrying sacks of flour and starting a fist fight in a tavern. The Jews are all positive characters and only think about how to selflessly help the artist and promote art. All the negative characters are non-Jews.

Then ask yourself the question: does this film raise the spiritual and cultural level of the people?

I would like to conclude my essay with the following story:

English composer and playwright Noël Coward took part in the creation of the 1940 Hollywood film Bittersweet. This is what he later wrote about the film in his diaries in July 1946 when he saw the film for a second time with some friends:

"Having only seen it once we had forgotten the full horror of it. It really is frightening that the minds of Hollywood could cheerfully perpetrate such a nauseating hotchpotch of vulgarity, false values, seedy dialogue, stale sentiment, vile performance and abominable direction. I had forgotten the insane coquetting of Miss Jeanette MacDonald allied to a triumphant lack of acting ability. I had forgotten the resolute, flabby heaviness of Mr. Nelson Eddy. I had forgotten the sterling work of the gentleman who saw fit to rewrite my dialogue and lyrics, whose name is Samuels... this vulgar orgy of tenth-rate endeavour."

I believe the above applies to the vast majority of Hollywood productions. Unfortunately, contemporary European cinema has not gone far from it.

In principle, everything said above is the personal assessment and opinion of the author. My goal is to allow the viewer to form his/her own opinion based on the films they watch. Enjoy.

Administrator.